



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/931,511	08/16/2001	Felix Mayer	0796/65739	3846

7590

08/11/2003

Donald S. Dowden
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARSHAD R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2855

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2003

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/931,511

Applicant(s)

MAYER ET AL.

Examiner

Harshad Patel

Art Unit

2855

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al. (4,548,078) in view of Landis et al. (4,672,997) (hereinafter Bohrer or Landis).
The detailed rejection not found in this office action should be reviewed in the prior office action. Bohrer teaches all the features of the instant invention including the two housing structures and the sensor chip mounted between the two housing structures. Bohrer indicates the two housing portions are sealably mounted but not specifically indicating as to how they are sealingly bonded. It may be glued or welded. Landis teaches two housing portions sealed together using an "O-ring" (36) (Fig. 3). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a sealing ring such as an "O-ring" since it is notoriously well known to provide a sealing mechanism between two housing elements where a leakage is possible. To avoid leakage one having ordinary skill in the art would provide such "O-rings" or any other sealing arrangements to prevent such leakage.
4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer in view of Araki (5,369,795).

The subject matter of the rejection not found in this rejection can be viewed in the prior office action.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gehman et al. (6,591,674) teaches a flow meter having two housing portions sealed together with an O-ring (39).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harshad Patel whose telephone number is (703) 305-4935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (7:00 AM-5:30 PM).



*Harshad Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2855*

hp
August 5, 2003